

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### PALESTINE

#### FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2022/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

The activities proposed hereafter are subject to any terms and conditions that may be included in the related Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP).

#### 1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge DG ECHO<sup>1</sup>/C3

Contact persons at HQ

Team Leader: Matthew Keyes  
[Matthew.Keyes@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Matthew.Keyes@ec.europa.eu)

Desk Officer: Aldo Biondi  
[Aldo.Biondi@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Aldo.Biondi@ec.europa.eu)

in the field

Head of Office: Olivier Rousselle  
[Olivier.Rousselle@echofield.eu](mailto:Olivier.Rousselle@echofield.eu)

Technical Assistant: Georgios Frantzis  
[Georgios.Frantzis@Echofield.Eu](mailto:Georgios.Frantzis@Echofield.Eu)

#### 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation<sup>2</sup>: EUR 26 588 797 of which an indicative amount of EUR 3 500 000 for Education in Emergencies.

In line with DG ECHO's commitment under the Grand Bargain initiative, pilot Programmatic Partnerships have been launched in 2020 and 2021 with a limited number of partners. New Programmatic Partnerships could be signed in 2022 with partners under indirect management. Part of the allocation of this HIP could therefore also be attributed to these new pilot Partnerships.

---

<sup>1</sup> Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)

<sup>2</sup> The Commission reserves the right not to award all or part of the funds made or to be made available under the HIP to which this Annex relates, or to allocate part of the funding to interventions with a regional or multi-country approach.

Breakdown per Actions as per Worldwide Decision (in euros):

Country(ies)	Action (a) Man-made crises and natural disasters	Action (b) Initial emergency response/small- scale/epidemics	Action (c) Disaster Preparedness	Actions (d) to (f) Transport / Complementary activities	TOTAL
Palestine	26 408 000				26 408 000
Regional flexibility reserve*	100 000				100 000
Coordination & Visibility*	80 797				80 797
<b>Total</b>					26 588 797

*\*In the framework of the Pilot Programmatic Partnership with IFRC*

### 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

*Proposals (single forms) can be submitted at any moment during the year. However, no formal request for proposals can be made before the publication of the HIP. Agreements can only be signed after adoption of the Worldwide Decision and release of the HIP to partners (both conditions need to be satisfied cumulatively).*

#### a) Co-financing:

Under the EU Financial Regulation, grants must involve co-financing; as a result, the resources necessary to carry out the action must not be provided entirely by the grant. An action may only be financed in full by the grant where this is essential for it to be carried out. In such a case, justification must be provided in the Single Form (section 10.4).

#### b) Financial support to third parties (implementing partners)

Pursuant to Art. 204 FR, for the implementation of actions under this HIP, partners may provide financial support to third parties, e.g. implementing partners. This financial support can only exceed EUR 60 000 if the objectives of the action would otherwise be impossible or excessively difficult to achieve. Such situations can occur in cases where only a limited number of non-profit non-governmental organisations have the capacity, skills or expertise to contribute to the

implementation of the action or are established in the country of operation or in the region(s) where the action takes place.

Ensuring broad geographical/worldwide coverage while minimising costs and avoiding duplications concerning in particular presence in country, prompted many humanitarian organisations to network, e.g. through families or confederations. In such a context, the situations referred to above would imply that the partner would rely on other members of the network. In such cases, justification must be provided in the Single Form.

c) Alternative arrangements

In case of country or crisis-specific issues or unforeseeable circumstances which arise during the implementation of the action, the Commission (DG ECHO) may issue specific ad-hoc instructions which partners must follow. Partners may also introduce via the Single Form duly justified requests for alternative arrangements to be agreed by the Commission (DG ECHO) in accordance with Annex 5 to the Grant Agreement.

d) Field office costs

Costs for use of the field office during the action are eligible and may be declared as unit cost according to usual cost accounting practices, if they fulfil the general eligibility conditions for such unit costs and the amount per unit is calculated:

- i. using the actual costs for the field office recorded in the beneficiary's accounts, attributed at the rate of office use and excluding any cost which are ineligible or already included in other budget categories; the actual costs may be adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements, if they are relevant for calculating the costs, reasonable and correspond to objective and verifiable information

and

- ii. according to usual cost accounting practices which are applied in a consistent manner, based on objective criteria, regardless of the source of funding.

e) Actions embedded in multiannual strategies

Funding under this HIP may be used to finance actions implemented in the framework of multiannual strategies, as and when provided for in the HIP.

f) Regional and multi-country actions

Regional/multi-country actions can be supported under this HIP (and where relevant in conjunction with other HIPs<sup>3</sup>), where they are proven more suitable/effective than country-based interventions to respond to identified needs, taking into account the operating context, the strategy and the priorities set out in the HIP (or respective HIPs), the operational guidelines provided in section 3.2.2. of this Annex, as well as the applicant

---

<sup>3</sup> For multi country actions falling under more than one HIP, partners are requested to submit only one proposal in APPEL. The single form should refer to the HIP that covers the majority of targeted countries.

organisation's capacities. The proposals should specify the breakdown between the different country allocations.

#### **4. ADMINISTRATIVE INFO**

##### **Allocation round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 25 000 000
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2022<sup>4</sup>
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Disaster Preparedness. Follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations financed under the 2021-2027 Multi annual Financial Framework, can be submitted as modification requests for the ongoing action with a time extension of up to 24 months and a total duration of the modified action of up to 48 months. The same approach may also be used to the extent appropriate in furtherance of any multiannual strategies provided for by the HIP (see point e) of section 2 above)<sup>5</sup>. Education in Emergencies actions should have an initial duration of at least 24 months, unless there is a needs- or context-based justification for a shorter duration.
- d) Potential partners<sup>6</sup>: All DG ECHO Partners
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modifications requests of ongoing actions <sup>7</sup>
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 17/01/2022<sup>8</sup>

##### **Allocation round 2**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 480 000<sup>9</sup>
- b) Provision of protection and assistance to Palestinians at risk of forcible transfer in the West Bank due to recurrent violations of international law through a multi-sectoral approach to reduce vulnerabilities, build capacity, and respond to threats.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/01/2022<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

<sup>5</sup> Additional guidance may be issued by DG ECHO in this respect, as appropriate.

<sup>6</sup> Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

<sup>7</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>8</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

<sup>9</sup> This allocation is conditional upon the payment of a contribution by Italy of EUR 500 000 to the EU budget as externally assigned revenue, minus a 4% management fee.

- d) Pre-selected partner: NRC-NO, in its capacity as the holder of the DG ECHO grant for the West Bank Protection Consortium to which the allocation is to contribute through submission of a modification request in the Single Form<sup>11</sup>
- e) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 15/09/2022.

### **Allocation round 3**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 1 428 797
- b) Cost will be eligible<sup>4</sup> from 01/04/2022
- c) Potential partner: IFRC. The funding will be allocated to the pilot Programmatic Partnership action 'Accelerating local action in humanitarian and health crises' in the following country: Palestine
- d) Information to be provided: Single form<sup>7</sup>

### **Allocation round 4**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 1 680 000<sup>12</sup>
- b) Provision of protection and assistance to Palestinians at risk of forcible transfer in the West Bank due to recurrent violations of international law through a multi-sectoral approach to reduce vulnerabilities, build capacity, and respond to threats.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/01/2022<sup>13</sup>
- d) Pre-selected partner: NRC-NO, in its capacity as the holder of the DG ECHO grant for the West Bank Protection Consortium to which the allocation is to contribute through submission of a modification request in the Single Form<sup>14</sup>
- e) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 15/12/2022.

---

<sup>10</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

<sup>11</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>12</sup> This allocation is conditional upon the payment of a contribution by Finland, France and Spain for a total of EUR 1 750 000 to the EU budget as externally assigned revenue, minus a 4% management fee.

<sup>13</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

<sup>14</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

## **4.1. Operational requirements:**

### **4.1.1 Assessment criteria:**

- 1) Relevance
  - How relevant is the proposed intervention and its compliance with the objectives of the HIP?
  - Has a joint needs assessment been used for the proposed intervention (if existing)?
  - Has the proposed intervention been coordinated with other relevant humanitarian actors?
- 2) Capacity and expertise
  - Does the partner, with its implementing partners, have sufficient expertise (country/region and/or technical)?
  - How good is the partner's local capacity/ability to develop local capacity?
- 3) Methodology and feasibility
  - Quality of the proposed response strategy, including intervention logic / logframe, output & outcome indicators, risks and challenges.
  - Feasibility, including security and access constraints.
  - Quality of the monitoring arrangements.
- 4) Coordination and relevant post-intervention elements
  - Extent to which the proposed intervention is to be implemented in coordination with other humanitarian actors and actions (including, where relevant, the use of single interoperable registries of beneficiaries).
  - Extent to which the proposed intervention/s contributes to resilience and sustainability.
- 5) Cost-effectiveness/efficiency/transparency
  - Does the proposed intervention display an appropriate relationship between the resources to employed, the activities to be undertaken and the objectives to be achieved?
  - Is the breakdown of costs sufficiently documented/explained?<sup>15</sup>

In case of actions ongoing in the field, where DG ECHO is requested to fund the continuation thereof, a field visit may be conducted by DG ECHO field expert (TA) to determine the feasibility and quality of the follow-up action proposed.

No award will be made to NGO partner organizations which have not complied with their obligations concerning the submission of audited financial statements (i.e. which would not have submitted those in due time to the Commission without a proper justification) or which would appear not to offer sufficient guarantee as to their financial capacity to

---

<sup>15</sup> In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section10)

implement the proposed actions (in light of their liquidity and independency ratios as appearing from their latest available annual statutory accounts certified by an approved external auditor).

Partners are expected to consider context-specific environmental arrangements to reduce the environmental footprint of the proposed actions, while preserving its effectiveness.

#### ***4.1.2 Specific operational guidelines and operational assessment criteria:***

This section outlines the specific operational guidelines that DG ECHO partners need to take into account in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG ECHO. It also lists and explains the assessment criteria – based on those outlined in section 4.1.1 - that DG ECHO will apply in the specific context of the HIP to which this Technical Annex relates when assessing proposals submitted in response to the related HIP.

The HIP Policy Annex should be consulted in parallel.

##### ***4.1.2.1 Health***

DG ECHO will prioritize interventions aimed at providing lifesaving healthcare assistance and preventing permanent disability to victims of violence and outbreaks, including emergency, surgical (e.g. trauma care), post-operative and rehabilitation care. Preparedness for response in the health sector may be considered to ensure that partners have the soft- and hardware capacity to respond to emergencies in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza Strip.

While the COVID-19 pandemic has an impact on the provision and access to basic services, including healthcare it is only in case of critical gaps that DG ECHO would consider a response. Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) will only be considered as an emergency response intervention integrated with other activities and / or mainstreamed in the proposed action.

In Gaza, priority will be given to health surveillance systems and Emergency Preparedness and Response along the trauma pathway with a focus on the pre-hospitalization and hospitalization phases.

##### ***4.1.2.2 WASH and Shelter***

For Gaza, interventions should aim to maintain a minimum level of WASH and Shelter emergency response capacity that also includes protection mainstreaming. At this stage, with the exception of a major escalation in Gaza, DG ECHO will not consider a stand-alone shelter response. Programmes could prioritize activities that focus on linkages between WASH and Health, particularly in health clinics and hospitals. DG ECHO will also consider community-based early warning systems of public health risks associated with water borne diseases.

With regard to projects involving solar energy or other environmentally sustainable solutions, DG ECHO will prioritize interventions in critical facilities with demonstrated necessity, effectiveness, viability and impact. Particular attention should be paid to the coordination of the proposed intervention amongst all actors.

##### ***4.1.2.3 Protection***

In the West Bank, the intended protection outcomes should focus on reinforcing the response to settler violence, military incursions, attacks against students and education

facilities, demolitions, preventive measures against destruction of Palestinian assets and include evidence-based advocacy plans focused on reducing International Humanitarian Law (IHL) violations. This should be addressed within an integrated multi-sectoral approach to programming targeting communities most vulnerable to protection violations.

In Gaza, the integrated emergency preparedness and response programming should clearly be designed in line with an analysis of context-specific threats, hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities and must include a comprehensive protection response package and evidence-based advocacy plans founded on monitoring and documentation of IHL violations.

Child protection needs and the provision of specialized services, alternative care and MHPSS may be supported. Quality, comprehensive and safe SGBV response services, including services integrated into health might be supported. Sexual and Gender-based violence (SGBV), Child protection (CP) and Mental health and Psychosocial support (MHPSS)<sup>16</sup> services should be in line with international guidance and integrated in case management protocols and referral pathways.

Utilisation of cash in protection programming must have a clear protection outcome and will not be supported unless embedded within legal assistance, case management or accompaniment, and within a wider comprehensive and integrated protection response.

#### ***4.1.2.4 Cash transfers & Basic Needs Approach (BNA)***

DG ECHO will prioritise an integrated multi-sectoral approach that aims to meet the basic needs of affected populations. This will be highly relevant for the nexus, with DG ECHO promoting the strengthening of the shock responsiveness of existing social protection systems. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area. Should this provide distinct added value, DG ECHO encourages a consortium approach to implement the BNA.

Protection-sensitive vulnerability targeting (see more under Protection) is an essential element of the BNA, and targeting should never be dependent only on status (e.g. refugee, displaced).

#### **Cash transfers**

Modality choice should be informed by a needs-based and people-centred response analysis, incorporating market, operational and environmental considerations. The use of cash should systematically be considered in actions funded by DG ECHO.

Where assistance is to be delivered in the form of cash transfers, particular attention will be paid to the principles laid down in DG ECHO's cash guidance note, which will form the basis for the assessment and selection of partners, in particular in the case of large-scale transfers. Partners will be expected to demonstrate a satisfactory efficiency ratio and, to the extent possible and taking into account the operational context, partners will be assessed on their ability to work based on common targeting criteria, single or interoperable beneficiary registries, a single payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework. In line with the cash guidance note, DG ECHO will expect partners to strive for segregation of duties and full transparency on the

---

<sup>16</sup> Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) will only be considered as an emergency response intervention integrated with other activities and / or mainstreamed in the proposed action.



costs of implementation. Furthermore, partners should ensure that the efficiency ratio is maintained throughout the action, unless otherwise approved by DG ECHO. For the delivery of smaller-scale cash transfers, DG ECHO will assess proposals paying particular attention the Guidance note's principles of coordination, harmonisation and multi-partner approach.

DG ECHO will continue prioritising cash transfers over vouchers and in-kind assistance as the default modality. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons behind the choice of a specific transfer modality through a detailed decision tree analysis and a robust gender-sensitive response analysis, which is mandatory. The choice of one modality over another needs to be justified, considering all relevant contextual factors and including an analysis of market functioning in the affected areas. Cash assistance should be risk informed and targeted based on socio-economic vulnerability and taking protection concerns of individuals and groups into account. In contexts of high inflation and currency depreciation, partners should put in place triggers to adapt cash transfers based on market monitoring data, and design programmes from the outset to anticipate potential inflationary shocks.

#### Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA)

In Gaza, DG ECHO and like-minded donors aim to consolidate a MPCA programme of sufficient scale to address the multi-faceted needs of the most vulnerable people. At the same time, this injects liquidity in support of the local economy. DG ECHO's response will be tailored to respond to conflict-shocks and specific, well-identified protection concerns. Key elements of the MPCA programme include:

- Harmonisation of the targeting approach based on socio-economic indicators, vulnerability criteria and context-specific protection risks;
- Single or interoperable beneficiary registries, a single payment mechanism;
- Agreement on standardised transfer values based on the Cash Working Group's Minimum Expenditure Basket ;
- Coordinated monitoring approach, including the adoption of Grand Bargain Multipurpose Cash Outcome Indicators<sup>17</sup>; and a common feedback mechanism;
- Markets should consistently be monitored to inform and adapt assistance;
- Functional distribution of tasks between implementing partners;
- Close coordination with the national social protection system, e.g. the "National Cash Transfer Programme (NCTP) led by the Ministry of Social Development and supported by the EU - PEGASE instrument.

Livelihood interventions can be considered provided they aim to increase beneficiaries' resilience to emergencies through a basic needs approach, to provide them with alternatives to negative coping strategies, and attempt to reduce their reliance on humanitarian assistance, particularly in Gaza. Activities could include the promotion of

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/multipurpose-cash-outcome-indicatorsfinal-draft-for-testingjuly-2019.pdf>

diversification of productive assets and practices, strengthening livelihood opportunities and value chains, restoring assets and income generating activities, and creating new economic opportunities in urban and rural areas. The interventions must be based on thorough needs and risk analysis, which should inform the response analysis and its delivery modality, in full respect of the do no harm principle.

#### ***4.1.2.5 Education in Emergencies (EiE)***

DG ECHO will support EiE interventions with an emphasis on access to protective learning environments, including safe and violence-free schools, ensuring learning continuity in crises, and addressing the psychosocial support needs of children in highly vulnerable communities, contributing to improved education participation and success, in both the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and Gaza Strip. All EiE interventions must integrate a COVID-19 response and child protection (e.g., referral, case management), contributing to the education outcome, as appropriate. Priority will be given to funding projects which target at least 50% of girls, unless there is a context-based justification for different targeting.

In the Gaza Strip, special consideration will be given to interventions that focus on:

- a. Incorporation of EiE into emergency response, including preparedness. ;
- b. Urban (most conflict affected) and most vulnerable rural (access restricted) areas.

In the West Bank, special focus should be directed to schools affected by demolitions, settler violence and military incursions. Preventative and responsive advocacy efforts for safe access to education must be considered.

Advocacy and legal support to schools under attack are key elements of the protection of education in Palestine.

EiE interventions should demonstrate coordination with other stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, UNRWA, Education Cannot Wait Joint Financing Arrangement donors and the Education cluster to optimize synergies, complementarities and avoid any overlap. Alignment with sector frameworks and efforts aimed at sustainability of interventions must be demonstrated. For cash in EiE projects, attention should be paid to sustainability of the intervention and, when possible, linkages to long-term livelihood solutions. Coordination support will be considered, if relevant and duly justified.

#### ***4.1.2.6 Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Preparedness (DP)***

All humanitarian actions must be risk informed. Therefore, partners are requested to ensure all projects submitted are designed based on a sound risk analysis, identifying the main threats for both the targeted populations and the action. Anticipatory and contingency measures should be embedded in the action to anticipate and mitigate these risks to the best possible extent.

In 2022, DG ECHO will continue to support targeted Disaster Preparedness (DP) actions by further strengthening DP systems in most at-risk locations of East Jerusalem (EJ), the West Bank (WB), and Gaza Strip.

The risk of conflict and escalation of violence remain the main entry points. Strengthening tools, services and mechanisms allowing for an effective medical response to this type of

disasters is therefore a key priority. Partners are requested to apply a sound conflict sensitive approach considering the specificities of each targeted area.

Natural disasters can be considered if the vulnerability of local populations to these threats is sufficiently demonstrated.

A focus on community-based systems and first-line responders will be ensured in all funded actions, fostering as much as possible their integration into the national DRM framework to sustainably increase the resilience of vulnerable communities. DP investments at community level will align with local and national priorities so that tools and mechanisms supported can be easily transferred to and managed by national and local services. Plans for an exit strategy should be included in the proposal.

All DRR/DP actions will have to include a strong focus on International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and advocacy for effective DRM and community resilience. DP Partners will be requested to include protection sensitive tools at community level to ensure both inclusiveness and do no harm. Partners are encouraged to coordinate with protection actors to inform their community protection analysis.

#### ***4.1.2.7 Humanitarian Advocacy***

Advocacy, at all levels (both field level and international fora), can be supported when it is based on strong evidence and clear objectives: the causes of the on-going deterioration of the humanitarian situation can only be addressed through effective advocacy, by calling all parties to respect IHL. Partners willing to carry out advocacy initiatives must share a detailed advocacy plan providing information on the activities to be undertaken and under which timeframe, resources required for implementation, expected outcomes, as well as potential risks and mitigation measures to be put in place. Partners should develop realistic, achievable and concrete advocacy plans and objectives, as well as specify the level at which advocacy activities should be undertaken. Advocacy should primarily focus on key protection issues, including violations of International Humanitarian and Human Rights Laws (IHL and IHRL), including issues related to access, protection of civilians including humanitarian workers and health staff.

#### ***4.1.2.8 Humanitarian – Development – Peace nexus***

DG ECHO partners are encouraged to support the operationalization of the triple nexus in Palestine as long as the proposed interventions are in line with a well-coordinated and well-founded analysis and response. Cash transfers, WaSH and health have been identified as a priority to implement the nexus by building complementarities and synergies, in particular with other EU services.

### **STRENGTHENING EARLY RESPONSE CAPACITY AND COORDINATION**

#### **(1) Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERM/RRM) as standalone actions**

Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERMs/RRMs) are stand-alone actions pooling capacities of different partners for improved and more coordinated preparedness and early response, guided by early warning and contingency plans. ERMs/RRMs are designed to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose assistance when other response mechanisms are not yet in place. ERMs/RRMs are mostly used for rapid-on-set crisis. For slow-on-set,

objective indicators with thresholds for engagement/disengagement should be defined in coordination with other stakeholders including the State Authorities.

(2) Flexibility embedded into the actions

Whenever relevant, partners should introduce flexibility to mobilize resources from ongoing actions and swiftly respond to any new emerging shocks occurring in the area of their operations (a crisis within a crisis). Flexibility measures can be triggered to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose response in the aftermath of a rapid onset crisis; the two main scenarios are: i) to fill the time gap while waiting for additional resources; ii) to respond to small scale humanitarian needs which would otherwise remain unattended.

The application of flexibility measures should be based on a multi-risk analysis and the development of worst and most likely scenarios. Partners should develop a detailed plan considering prepositioning of stocks, surge staff, triggers and sectors of intervention.

ERM/RRM and flexibility measures are complementary and do not exclude each-other; flexibility measures enable to bridge the time gap between the shock and the time needed to mobilize ad-hoc resources through the ERM/RRM or additional funding. Timeliness of response is a key element for effectiveness of both flexibility measures and ERM/RRM. Partners should adopt indicators to measure the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance (e.g. lifesaving response for xxx persons, and/or need assessment within xxx days from the displacement/disaster/alert/exceeded triggers).